

find. We are happy to do this. The industry provides economic opportunity.

But can you imagine providing the infrastructure in your State, for a construction company building hundreds of skyscrapers such as this in your backyard? These underwater skyscrapers all have to be built and parts manufactured and moved to the site. All of this material moves through the fragile environment of coastal Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

If this monument, or if this structure, were out of the water to be seen, it would be as if you stacked the Washington Monument end to end 10 times. It is the kind of structure that has to be built to mine these sorts of finds in the gulf.

In 1998, Federal mineral development from offshore totaled approximately \$2.8 billion. That is what we sent to the Federal Government. Yet we only received \$20 million. That is less than a tenth of 1 percent.

Let me state that again—a tenth of 1 percent is what Louisiana was able to retain. Other States retained 50 percent. In addition, they received other payments. This situation is obviously not just; it is unfair, and this bill attempts to help correct that inequity.

As a result of OCS activity, Louisiana has suffered a significant negative environmental impact. We have lost over 1,000 square miles of coastal wetlands over the last 50 years. If we don't take action today, we are liable to lose another 1,000 square miles more in the next 50 years.

To bring this down to size, we lose a football field every day. We lose an area the size of the State of Rhode Island every year.

These losses are partially due to natural erosion but are aggravated by the way we have levied the Mississippi River, which, again, serves as a port for our entire Nation and not just our State, and it is also impacted by the activities associated with oil and gas drilling.

The people of Louisiana, while understanding that this is very important and this is a national asset—and, again, we are happy for the industry and want to promote an environmentally sensitive way of drilling as we know it today—believe that we should be more justly compensated for these impacts.

The distribution formula in S. 25 is weighted to provide an extra portion to those six States with Federal offshore oil production. We are not giving any incentive for future production. We want this to be a drilling-neutral bill, if you will, but a revenue-sharing bill that acknowledges the contribution made by our producing States.

As proposed in S. 25, Louisiana will only receive 10 percent of the Federal revenues that are generated. Again, historically, we have received less than one-tenth of 1 percent. Historically and

to date in the law, the interior States have received 50 percent. We are asking for our fair share and modest share of this money, and S. 25 outlines a 10-percent portion.

The cosponsors of S. 25 believe it is appropriate to share a portion of Federal OCS revenues with coastal States that do not and will not have any offshore oil production.

Today there is no dedicated source of funding for the variety of coastal environmental problems that are being experienced around the Nation, even in those States that are not producing. S. 25 recognizes that the producing States should be acknowledged and those States which are nonproducing also have challenges with their coastline—beach erosion, et cetera.

When Congress created the Land and Water Conservation Fund over 30 years ago, it was intended “to provide a steady revenue stream to preserve irreplaceable lands of natural beauty and unique recreational value.” Royalties from offshore oil and gas leases will provide the money, giving the program an interesting symmetry. Dollars raised from depleting one natural resource would be used to protect another.”

This, unfortunately, has not come true. These moneys were given but taken away. They were appropriated in different amounts over the years. This bill will attempt to use the dollars produced by depleting one natural resource to preserve many areas of natural beauty in our Nation, both on the coast and in our interior States.

This is an important bill for Louisiana and the gulf coast, but it is important for the entire Nation. Our legacy as leaders will be the land we leave to our children and their children. At the rate we are going, we might not have very much to give them.

This bill will give us a steady stream of revenue to provide full funding for our land and water conservation, to give much-needed resources for our coastal States to mitigate some of this negative impact and also to share justly with the other States in our Nation.

I thank the Chair for allowing us to have this time today. I, again, thank the majority leader and the chairman, and to the 20 or more sponsors we have for this legislation. It is my hope that we can mark this up shortly and move this bill through the process.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reserving the right to object, we were supposed to be in the policy committee starting at 12:30 p.m.

The Senator from Alabama.

## CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, S. 25, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, offers a unique opportunity for the entire nation to enjoy the tangible benefits of Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas production. It redirects a portion of royalties from Outer Continental Shelf production directly back to States and local communities for environmental and conservation programs.

The effect of this bill will be to provide States and local communities funding to expand and maintain parks and to enhance hunting, fishing and other outdoor recreational activities.

In addition, this bill would redirect a portion of Outer Continental Shelf Royalties back to the States which have endured the risks of production through the bill's Coastal Impact Assistance program. This program will provide dedicated funding to coastal States for air quality, water quality and to mitigate the environmental effects of Outer Continental Shelf infrastructure developments.

Alabama might use these funds to help ensure water quality in Mobile Bay, part of the National Estuary Program, and for the preservation and restoration of oyster beds and other sensitive environments areas along our coast. States may choose to establish a protected trust fund, as Alabama has with existing state royalties, in order to use the revenues in perpetuity for environmental and conservation purposes.

Alabama is one of only six States with active Outer Continental Shelf natural gas production off its shore and onshore infrastructure to refine and transport those resources. Alabama ranks ninth in the country for natural gas production and produced over 430 billion cubic feet of natural gas in 1994. There are four onshore refineries and numerous natural gas pipelines to process Outer Continental Shelf natural gas. The State has made a significant investment in providing the land and infrastructure to handle this production, yet has not been able to enjoy any direct royalty benefits from Outer Continental Shelf production.

This bill takes a step towards ensuring Alabama and the entire nation receive at least a part of the direct benefits of Outer Continental Shelf production.

I commend the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, for their tremendous leadership on this issue and look forward to the passage of this bill soon.

I express my appreciation to Senators MURKOWSKI and LANDRIEU for working on this legislation. I have worked with them from the beginning. It has good potential to allow States to retain some of the oil and gas money for remediating environmental damage

from production and for improving their environmental quality in general. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to participate in today's discussion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). Senator LANDRIEU and Senator MURKOWSKI deserve great credit for their efforts to restore the LWCF's important conservation goals, as does Senator LOTT for his commitment to addressing this issue on a bipartisan basis.

Congress originally intended that revenues from off-shore oil and gas drilling be deposited into a Land and Water Conservation Fund to allow the federal and state governments to protect green space, improve wildlife habitat, and purchase lands for conservation purposes. I have come to appreciate this program, as the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been used by local and state governments in South Dakota to purchase park lands and develop many of the facilities that exist in municipal and state parks throughout the state.

For the past five years, however, the state side of the LWCF has not been funded, the revenues from off-shore oil and gas drilling have been used to fund other federal programs. As a result, much-needed local and state park improvement projects have been held back, and there has been growing pressure in recent years to divert these funds back to their original purpose.

Americans depend increasingly on parks and open spaces for recreation because they allow all of us to deal better with the stress of modern life. Therefore, it is important that states are given the resources they need to improve parks and public lands, and I am prepared to work in a bipartisan fashion to enact legislation this year to ensure greater annual funding of conservation efforts from off-shore oil and gas drilling revenues.

A number of proposals, many of which are bipartisan, have been proposed by the administration and members of Congress to ensure that future off-shore oil and gas drilling revenues are dedicated to conservation purposes. A consensus appears to be developing that considerably more resources should be invested to protect and maintain rural and urban parks, preserve farmland and forests, provide incentives for the protection of endangered species on private lands, fully fund payments-in-lieu-of-taxes, and protect coastal resources.

I believe that this legislation could have a tremendous positive impact on local, state, and national parks, and greatly enhance outdoor recreation and environmental education projects throughout South Dakota and the nation. It is my strong hope that Congress will produce compromise legislation reflecting many of the basic objec-

tives contained in these proposals and ensure a strong future for our nation's natural resources. I am dedicated to working with Senators LANDRIEU, MURKOWSKI, and LOTT to achieve this goal.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator BREAUX, Senator LOTT, and others in supporting the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999. This important legislation will provide consistent funding to state fish and wildlife conservation programs to help maintain our precious natural resources, and will help to bring more Nebraskans back to the river—in our case, the Missouri River. This legislation will give states the necessary funding to carry out a flexible, non-regulatory approach to conservation that prevents species and their habitats from becoming endangered and to restore fish and wildlife populations to healthy numbers. This legislation is consistent with and fully complementary to the Missouri River Valley Improvement Act of 1999 that I recently introduced, along with my colleagues Senator DASCHLE and Senator JOHNSON.

The most important provisions of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act for my home state of Nebraska are Titles II and III, the Land and Water Conservation Fund reform provisions. Title III of this legislation would restore state-side funding to the Land and Water Conservation Fund—funding that has been diverted in recent years for other uses. However, as emphasized by the bill's authors and supporters, restoration of these funds to states is more important now than ever before, as Nebraska and all states are faced with accelerated population growth and urban sprawl, and increased demand by families, communities, and the business sector for recreation and conservation areas—areas that draw people and economic growth. Nebraska, as well as other states, has relied on hunters and anglers to provide the bulk of financial support for fish and wildlife programs—particularly through the purchase of hunting and fishing licenses and through excise taxes on sporting goods. However, these funds have not been adequate to address the needs of declining nongame species. Titles II and III of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act would provide a permanent Federal funding source to meet these needs in Nebraska and other states, and would revitalize the state matching grants program.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as passed in 1965, utilized a portion of the proceeds from Outer Continental Shelf mineral leasing revenues to give to state and local governments for recreation and conservation purposes as those governments deemed necessary and beneficial for their communities. In 1997, a record \$5.2 billion in royalties, rents, and bonus payments from new lease sales was collected by

the Federal government. Significant federal revenues from Outer Continental Shelf leasing and production has been designated by law for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but since 1995, Congress has not appropriated these monies to the states, but rather has transferred most of these funds to the U.S. Treasury for other uses. This important legislation would rectify this, and bring the funding source back to Nebraska and to local Nebraska communities. State and local governments match, dollar for dollar, Federal Land and Water Conservation funds for open space conservation and recreation in our communities. This act would restore the state and local funding, bolster the federal funding component, and also secure funding for urban parks and recreational areas.

While this act would currently provide 7 percent of Land and Water Conservation Funds to the states, I signed a letter today, along with several of my colleagues in the Senate, urging that funding for this provision be increased to 10 percent—a level that I believe to be consistent with the needs that exist in my state of Nebraska and in others. Besides providing recreational funding support for community needs, this source of funds can have a significant impact on non-regulatory approaches to preventing wildlife species from being listed as threatened or declined under the Endangered Species Act—listings which often find landowners embroiled in private property rights vs. species protection laws. By enabling communities and states to preserve identified areas where habitat and species can be allowed to flourish with minimal or little disruption on the lives and activities of people, we can help to prevent future listings, and to safeguard against some of the social and economic disruptions that have often accompanied past listings.

Additionally, wildlife conservation, conservation education, and wildlife-associated recreational programs—all of which contribute increasingly significant tourism and recreational dollar returns to the state of Nebraska—are traditionally underfunded. The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies estimates these needs nationally to be approximately one billion dollars per year.

Increasing Title III funding to 10 percent of Outer Continental Shelf receipts would give Nebraska approximately an additional \$1.7 million annually—money that I know from the people of Nebraska is both needed and would be well-spent.

The Nebraska State Legislature passed a resolution this year in support of this bill, as did the City of Grand Island in Nebraska. Nebraska Governor Mike Johanns is one of 27 Governors to officially support this legislation. All 50 state fish and wildlife agencies, including the Nebraska Game and Parks

Commission, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, and more than 3,000 local entities, businesses, clubs, and conservation organizations have endorsed the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999. Nationwide, more than 200 state and local ballot initiatives sought to commit billions of dollars for conservation, farmland protection, and urban revitalization policies. More than 70 percent of these initiatives were supported by voters. I enthusiastically add my support to this impressive list of supporters, and look forward to working with Senator LANDRIEU and our colleagues to finalize and pass this important legislation.

#### ONE GIANT LEAP FOR MANKIND

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to recognize a day that is certainly going to be remembered, as we go into the next millennium, as symbolizing this century. Each century has one or two things that define it. It is what schoolchildren remember. It is what adults remember. Everyone remembers where they were when certain events happened, whether it was President Roosevelt saying on the radio that the war was over, whether it was the assassination of President John Kennedy, or whether it was Neil Armstrong taking one giant leap for mankind.

I believe July 20, 1969, 30 years ago, was clearly one of the defining moments of our century, although it would be very difficult to choose which moment had the most lasting impact. The day Neil Armstrong stepped on the Moon, the spirit of America was rejuvenated. It also was the culmination of years of discoveries, of scientific missions, of behind-the-scenes scientific experiments that were all a big show on July 20. I think it is important for us on a day such as today to recognize what all of those scientific experiences did and what we have gained from the space program.

In fact, when we look at the cost of the Apollo project, it cost about \$25 billion. In 1990 dollars, it would be about \$95 billion. It was an investment. The good news is, because America was willing to go for it, because America said the Moon is there and we can do it, we have had a 9-to-1 return on every dollar we have invested.

What is the 9-to-1 return? It is the newly created products and technologies and the new jobs that have come about as a result of those technologies that is the return on our investment. What space has given to our economy is a 9-to-1 return on our investment.

There have been 30,000 spinoffs from our space research. Let me tell you a few.

Satellites: Satellites are part of our daily lives. We now get instant access

on the news anywhere in the world because of satellites. We can see press conferences anywhere in the world live because of satellites. We see satellites as part of our defense. A defense system for an incoming missile is going to result because we have satellite technology.

Computers: The microchip—how has that made a difference in our lives? Who can even ask the question about what computers have done. We see people with laptops in the airports, on airplanes. It is just phenomenal. This started with space research, not on the Senate floor, Mr. President.

High-quality software, high-performance computing, fiber-optic networks, water purification systems, Teflon—Teflon has improved the quality of life for all of us in this country who have spent even 1 minute in the kitchen. Digital watches, cordless tools, and, most notable, in my opinion, is space explorations' contribution to medical science. CAT scans and MRIs are revolutionizing our ability to detect tumors early enough so we can save lives.

Our quality of life has significantly improved since Neil Armstrong took the giant leap for mankind. It was to that moment that all of us related what America had accomplished. That happened 30 years ago today.

I congratulate Neil Armstrong, the Apollo 11 crew, and all those at Johnson Space Center in Houston, TX, who contributed to the giant leap for mankind and the quality of life that all of us live, because those brave astronauts were willing to take the risk and the chance.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived and passed, the Senate now stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 1:05 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:19 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. FITZGERALD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1396 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield the floor.

#### DISAPPROVING THE EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO THE PRODUCTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH, is recognized to offer a motion to discharge the Finance Committee of S.J. Res. 27, on which there will be 1 hour of debate equally divided.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, pursuant to the Trade Act of 1974 and the rules of the Senate, I do make a privileged motion that the Senate Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 27, a resolution disapproving the President's June 3, 1999 extension of normal trade relations with China.

It is my understanding that based on the parliamentary decisions made earlier, the 1 hour will be equally divided, a half hour under my control and a half hour under the control of the other side, not by majority/minority, but by the two sides, pro and con.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. It is also my understanding, for the benefit of my colleagues, that there will be two consecutive rollcall votes, the first one being on the China discharge and the second one on the Vietnam discharge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, notice of my intention to do these discharge motions was made to both the majority and minority leaders, the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee, and several other Senators on July 7, so there would be ample time for the leaders to adjust the time so we could have a vote prior to the House voting on this matter.

Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes out of my allotted time.

Despite President Clinton's 1992 campaign promise to link MFN certification to China's human rights record, the administration has chosen annually to grant Beijing what had been known as most-favored-nation status and is now called normal trading relations. It is amazing to me that that